



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

. . . as in the first syllable of ἀθάνατος." This word is used with the same metrical value by Sappho, whose dialect is not usually thought artificial.

P. 520. "Among words found only in the Odyssey occur . . . ἀριθμός, εὐχή, κτήμα." But ἀριθμέω occurs in B 124, εὐχολή and κτήματα often in the Iliad.

P. 520. "The same word has different significations" in the two poems. "In the Iliad κλείς is a *collar bone*, . . . ὤτειλή a *wound* . . . ἐρίς the *battle-strife*. In the Odyssey the same words mean *key*, *scar*, *rivalry*." In fact κληρίς, besides meaning in both poems a *bolt* and a *thole-pin*, means *collar bone* only in the Iliad, *tongue* of a brooch once in the Odyssey, and *key* often in the Odyssey and once (Z 89) in the Iliad; ὤτειλή is always *wound* in both poems (κ 164, τ 456, ω 189; the word for *scar*, occurring only in the Odyssey, is οὐλή); ἐρίς is *conflict*, *quarrel* in both poems, *battle-strife* in the Iliad, *rivalry* in the Odyssey and once (H 111) in the Iliad. "The accusative of ἐρίς in the Odyssey is the analogic ἐριν of the Attic dialect." But ἐρίδα also occurs twice in the Odyssey (ζ 92, θ 210).

P. 520. "By means of is represented by ἐκπι in the Iliad, by ἰότητι in the Odyssey." In fact, ἐκπι is used only in the Odyssey, ἰότητι in both poems.

P. 520. "It is perhaps of little moment that the later analogic comparative of φίλος, φίλτερος, is found only in the Iliad, φιλίων being alone employed in the Odyssey." φιλίων occurs twice in the Odyssey, and φίλτερος once (λ 360). φίλτατος, which implies φίλτερος, appears three times in the Odyssey.

P. 520. "We cannot overlook the significance of the fact that the contracted (*sic*) form of παρά, πάρ, occurs only before the letters γ, ζ, ξ, σ, and τ in the Iliad, and only before κ and μ in the Odyssey." It should be said that πάρ occurs before δ, λ, ν, and π in both poems, before γ, ζ, ξ, σ, and τ only in the Iliad, and before κ and μ only in the Odyssey, although the compounds παρκατέλεκτο, παρμέμβλωκε, παρμένετε occur in the Iliad.

Very probably more such errors might be found on a more careful examination, but this will do for a *Blumenlese*. Surely in an essay on minute points of language, designed to instruct a wide circle of students, such carelessness deserves censure. It makes a reader hesitate to receive any statement in the essay without verification. It will be observed that I have made no reference to any divergence in the *opinions* expressed in this essay from well-established doctrine, or to the method followed in the discussion.

LEWIS R. PACKARD.

ON THE DIPYLON VASES.

Sir: In my report (Vol. II, p. 258) of the Mittheilungen des deutschen archäologischen Institutes in Athen, in the abstract of Arthur Milchhöfer's *Gemalte Grabstelen*, is the following passage: "The absence of [funereal] monuments in the Vth century [B. C.] he explains thus: The mound, he thinks, was crowned by vases in the VIth century, the so-called Dipylon vases. These were succeeded by the black-figured *prothesis* amphoræ with funeral scenes," &c. I see that in condensing thirty-one pages into twenty-seven lines I have committed Milchhöfer to a date for the "Dipylon" vases when he had not expressed an opinion on that point, saying only that the black-figured *prothesis* vases were, so he conjectured, the direct successors

of the large "Dipylon" vases in the office of furnishing an apex for the burial-mound. Taking into consideration, however, the time when the black-figured style came into fashion, his words would imply that he placed the close of the "Dipylon" vases in the VIth century B. C. It may be well to group here the opinions on the period of this interesting class of early Greek pottery. A very fine specimen is in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, the great vase of Curium in the Cesnola Collection (Cesnola's *Cyprus*, plate 29, p. 332). A large number are figured in the plates of Conze's *Zur Geschichte der Anfänge griechischer Kunst* (Vienna Academy *Sitzungsberichte*, Philos.-Hist. Classe, 1870). Others in *Monumenti dell' Istituto*, vol. 9, plates 39-40, and the *Annali*, 1872, plates I-K. The decoration (*i. e.* not including scenes with human figures) of the pottery called "Oriental," "Asiatic," "Corinthian," consists of animals, especially Asiatic carnivora, lion, tiger, panther; monsters of Asiatic fairy tales, crosses between bird, beast and man; arabesques from the vegetal world. This class of pottery has long been familiar to archaeologists, and its period is VII-VIth centuries B. C.

The other system of early Greek decoration, the "geometric," consists of short right lines arranged in various patterns; undulating lines, spirals, concentric rings; a few European animals; no vegetal arabesques, no savage beasts and monsters of Asiatic plains and imagination. The decoration of the "Dipylon" vases is a subdivision of the "geometric," adding to the above the special feature of concentric rings united into rows by oblique tangents. As a separate independent class of Greek pottery the "geometric" vases have been known hardly more than ten years. They were confounded with the very different "Corinthian" vases until Conze, in 1870, in the Vienna Academy's *Sitzungsberichte*, established them in their rights. He proved that they belonged to an entirely different system of decoration from the "Corinthian," "Asiatic," "Oriental," and finding this "geometric" decoration spread over primitive Europe (Germany, Britain, Italy), he pronounced it Indo-European. The "geometric" pottery of Greece he assigned to a day earlier than the time when Phoenicians and other Orientals came into contact with Greeks, namely, before the close of the second millennium B. C., acknowledging that many of the individual vases in our possession may well have been made after this contact. We may, therefore, take Conze's date, as stated by him in 1870, as about 1000 B. C. (Additional discussion by him in Vienna Academy's *Sitzungsberichte*, 1873.) Brunn, in his *Probleme in der Geschichte der Vasenmalerei* (Bavarian Academy's *Abhandl. Philos. Philol. Classe*, vol. 12, 1871, p. 107), declared in favor of Conze's views. G. Hirschfeld, in publishing, 1872, in the *Annali* and *Monumenti dell' Istituto* some freshly discovered vases dug up at the Dipylon Gate in Athens, gave in his adhesion to the views of Conze, but doubted the existing specimens being so old as the second millennium B. C., admitting, however, that undoubtedly a long interval intervened between the "Dipylon" and the "Corinthian" vases. It was the place of discovery of the large number of which Hirschfeld treated in the *Annali* that gave this class its present name of "Dipylon" pottery. Since 1872 the date has been

brought still further down. Within the last ten years our knowledge has been extended far back into pre-classic Greece by increased devotion to the historical method, by excavations in Mycenae, Olympia, the Aegean coast and islands, &c., by the presence of the German Archaeological Institute in Athens.

Furtwängler and Löschcke, who belong to the younger generation of German archaeologists, have done most within the last decade in establishing the development of early Greek decoration, as Milchhöfer in the early sculpture. The views of Furtwängler and Löschcke are as follows: (Furtwängler, *Bronzeperiode aus Olympia*, Berlin Academy's *Abhandlungen*, 1879, pp. 7-10, 27, 34, 43; Löschcke, *Annali dell' Istituto*, 1878, p. 306; Furtwängler, *Annali*, 1880, pp. 120, 121.) The usual view that the "geometric" decoration came first, then the "Oriental," is wrong. From the earliest times known to us down to the classic decoration with human figures and arabesques of lotos flower and palm leaf, both systems existed together, for in the oldest graves of Mycenae vases with merely vegetal decoration were found accompanied by others with "geometric" patterns. Thus the "Corinthian" was only a later stage of the Mycenaean, adding the wild beasts and monsters of Asia to the early use of vegetal ornament. Furtwängler showed that the "Dipylon" decoration was a subdivision of the "geometric"; that its home was on the Aegean islands and coast; that its characteristic feature is the rows of concentric rings united by tangents; that so far it has not been found west of Greece, neither in Italy nor in Northwestern Europe, and that even in Western Greece it is at present known only in very early remains lately dug up in Olympia and Dodona. As to the date of the "Dipylon" pottery, these archaeologists think it flourished in the VIIth century, and in its decline extended well into the VIth century B. C.

A. D. SAVAGE.

New York, February, 1882.

Sir: One word more on the Fragments of Sophocles, in reply to Mr. R. Ellis.

1. It is right that I should send a brief rejoinder to the acute and learned criticism with which Mr. Ellis has honoured me, if only to make the proper *amende* for having misapprehended his interpretation of Fr. 593.¹ Of course, as soon as my attention was recalled to the place, I understood Mr. Ellis's meaning perfectly, and I can only regret that I had not communicated with him in time to correct the error in my book. With regard to the interpretation, however, I must still think Mr. Ellis's view of the passage somewhat forced, both in respect of the language and the meaning. Mr. F. A. Paley, who agrees with me in joining *ὑπο* (*sic*) to *ποταμίων ποτῶν*, suggests **σταθεῖσα* as a correction of *†σπασθεῖσα*—an emendation which to my mind is perfectly convincing. 'And in the meadow, making a sudden stand, she all at once beholds her reflected image, where she is mirrored by the liquid stream.'

¹Amer. Jour. of Philol. Vol. II, p. 421.